

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 LEO DAVID HANSON,

3:13-cv-00397-MMD-WGC

7 Plaintiff,

ORDER

8 v.

9 PAULI, et. al.,

10 Defendants.
11

12 Defendants have filed a Motion to Submit Medical Records in Camera in support of their
13 motion for summary judgment. (Doc. # 21.)

14 Upon reviewing the motion it appears that Defendants actually seek to submit medical
15 records in support of their motion for summary judgment *under seal* and not *in camera*. Local
16 Rule 10-5 governs in camera and under seal submissions. Papers submitted for *in camera* review
17 are **not** filed with the court, and thus are generally not viewed by other parties. Documents
18 submitted under seal, on the other hand, are filed with the court but are sealed from public view.
19 Defendants indicate that they intend for Plaintiff to be able to view the medical records that
20 support their dispositive motion. Therefore, Defendants' motion to submit medical records in
21 camera (Doc. # 21) is **DENIED**.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///


27 ///

28 ///

1 Defendants are instructed to file a properly supported motion for leave to file the
2 documents under seal. Defendants are reminded that a motion to file documents accompanying a
3 dispositive motion under seal must identify "compelling reasons" to overcome the presumption
4 in favor of public access. *See Oliner v. Kontrabecki*, --- F.3d---, 2014 WL 1088254, at * 1 (9th
5 Cir. Mar. 20, 2014) (citation omitted); *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d
6 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006).

7
8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9
10 DATED: April 24, 2014



WILLIAM G. COBB
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE